Critical Food Creation Rubric

Category	F (Fail)	D (Below Average Work)	C (Average Work)	B (Excellent Work)	A (Superior Work)
Description and Explanation of Art Piece	No description or unclear what was created. No connection to food themes or project goals.	Minimal or vague description of the art piece; weak or confusing connection to food themes.	Basic description of the art piece; general idea of connection to food themes or group topic.	Clear, specific explanation of the art piece; strong connection to chosen topic and food-related themes.	Thorough, engaging, and insightful description of the art piece; clearly and creatively connects to food themes and group goals.
Analysis and Integration of Course Readings	No course readings referenced.	One course reading referenced, with little or no connection to the art piece.	Two course readings referenced with basic or partial connections.	Three course readings referenced, clearly linked to the art's concept and message.	Four or more course readings referenced, integrated thoughtfully and critically to deepen understanding of the artwork.
Connection to Food Sovereignty	No discussion of food sovereignty or community engagement.	Mentions food sovereignty superficially; lacks relevance or understanding.	Provides a general link to food sovereignty or community food groups.	Explains clearly how the project supports food sovereignty or campus/community initiatives.	Provides an insightful, original discussion of how the project fosters campus and community food sovereignty.
Reflection on the Creative Process	No reflection or irrelevant commentary.	Very limited reflection; unclear what was learned.	Basic reflection; identifies some learning but lacks depth.	Thoughtful reflection; clearly explains insights and challenges in the creative process.	Deep, nuanced reflection; offers meaningful insights into learning, creativity, and collaboration.
Clarity, Structure, and Style	Disorganized, unclear, or incomplete.	Writing is confusing, lacks flow, and has many unclear sections.	Some clarity and organization, but uneven or loosely structured.	Clear, well-structured, and easy to follow; ideas flow logically.	Polished, highly engaging writing; excellent structure, flow, and readability. No spelling or grammar mistakes.
Quality and Use of External Sources	External are entirely unreliable.	Poor-quality external sources; little relevance to the project.	Some credible external sources used but not well integrated.	Reliable and relevant external sources effectively support the report.	High-quality, well-chosen external sources integrated seamlessly to support analysis.
Total Sources (Readings + Others)	No sources used.	Fewer than 4 total sources.	4 total sources.	5 total sources.	6 or more total sources.
Word Count (500–800 words)	Fewer than 400 words or more than 1200 words.	400 – 424 words or 951-1200 words.	425–449 words or 851–950 words.	450–499 words or 800–850 words.	500–800 words (within assigned range).